

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claim 4 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Applicants has so rewritten claim 4 in independent form.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Haran (Comverse Network Systems).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(b) rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Haran (Converse Network Systems).

Applicants respectfully contend that Haran does not anticipate claim 1 and 8, because Haran does not teach each and every feature of claims 1 and 8. For example, Haran does not teach the features: "said means for creating message signals not being comprised by a service node of the network" (claim 1) and "said creating the message signals not being performed by a service node of the network" (claim 8).

The Examiner argues: "The system creates message signals that are compatible with the signaling network and service nodes, in response to transaction signals (address resolution query, pg. 1048 col. 2 lines 54-56)." In response, Applicants contend that on page 1048, col. 2, lines 54-56, Haran identifies Service Node "A" as issuing the address resolution query. Thus, a service node of the network is indeed creating the address resolution query which the Examiner has alleged is the message signal of claims 1 and 8. Therefore, Applicants contend that Haran does not teach the aforementioned features of claims 1 and 8.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Haran does not anticipate claims 1 and 8, and that claims 1 and 8 are in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-3 and 6-7 depends from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 2-3 and 6-7 are likewise in condition for allowance. Since claim 9 depends from claim 8, Applicants contend that claim 9 is likewise in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 08/13/2003

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

OFFICIAL